

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 10 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1 to 6 have been further amended to make still more explicit that which was inherent when the claims were considered as a whole. The resource request itself, as shown in Figs. 43A & B for example, is sent directly from the end-user host system to the resource peer group and is not resent or redirected. The resource request is processed as first received, since it is received only once. Applicants respectfully note that in an obviousness rejection, any inherent feature for the invention recited in the Claims is supposed to be considered in the "as a whole" analysis. Accordingly, these amendments do not raise new issues and do not require a further search.

Claims 1 to 10 remain rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196 to Reiche (hereinafter, Reiche) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,904 to Rode (hereinafter, Rode).

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 5. Applicants respectfully note that Reiche teaches at Col. 8, lines 47 to 59:

Firstly, a client 100 makes a request (step 200) for a connection to a secure customer HTTP server such as 126 by specifying an URL. The URL contains the address of the Authentication Daemon 124 located on the customer server 120, and therefore connects to the AD (step 202) to establish the connection through the digital network 160. The purpose of the Authentication Daemon 124 involvement is to determine if the request made by the client can be authorized. More specifically, the Authentication Daemon 124 will inspect the HTTP header of the data sent by the browser of the client for a special URL (step 204) **This information, to be generated and embedded later in the header, is not available at this point.** (Emphasis Added)

Thus, Reiche expressly teaches that the client first sends a request to a customer server that includes the desired

resource using a URL. Thus, on the first receipt of that request directly from the end user, Reiche expressly taught that the URL did not include information needed to access the resource.

Reiche then goes on from this teaching through Col 10, line 35 to teach a complicated series of actions that include an authentication server. Then, Reiche teaches at Col 10, lines 39 to 49:

In accordance with the 302-redirect procedure, the client browser 100 **reconnects** to the AD 124 on the customer server 120 (step 200), requesting the original URL (customer HTTP server 126). This time, the AD 124 detects the presence of the AD cookie embedded earlier and extracts the correct AD cookie from others that may be present. The row ID, client ID and transaction ID are determined from the cookie and, at step 262 and 264, are verified against the memory table 122. In addition, the number of transactions completed is checked (step 266) and the number of transactions left is decremented by one (step 268). (Emphasis Added)

Thus, Reiche expressly taught that a reconnection was necessary, which clearly means that this is not the first transmittal of the request and that the request on the reconnection is different from the request first received.

The MPEP requires that Reiche be considered as whole. Reiche expressly taught a first connection and then a reconnection and so teaches away from:

receiving, by a resource server peer group directly from an end-user host system, a resource request for a resource stored on said resource server peer group, said resource request including, at time of first receipt of said resource request itself from a first transmission of said resource request directly from said end-user host system, a request for said resource and a rights key credential, said rights key credential comprising:

Reiche expressly taught that the first request received did not contain the necessary information and only after a

complex authentication process, a second different request to the customer server was required on the reconnection. Reiche unambiguously describes that the request that results in the customer server providing the resource is not the original resource request itself, but one that has been modified as taught by Reiche.

Reiche, through use of the authentication server and the multiple redirections teaches away from a resource server peer group that processes a request when it is first received without resort to an authentication server and the multiple redirections.

The rationale for continuing the rejection reduces the express claim limitations to a gist, "a single request for a resource" and then characterizes Reiche as "just different communication steps as part of the single resource request." With all due respect, the claims expressly describe what the first request that is received directly from the end-user host system includes, and so the claim recites more than a single request. The claims expressly define the form of that first request and what is included in that request. In contrast as noted above, Reiche describes a first request and defines that what is in that first request is different from that recited in these claims. Reiche clearly did not consider or suggest a simplification of access grant control process so that the first request directly to the customer server was acted upon by the customer server to provide the resource because "The redirect procedure is an important component of this method because it establishes a central site to which requests made by a user browsers are redirected . . ." Reiche at Col. 6, line 64 to Col. 7, line 1.

Applicants note that a secondary reference was cited, but the information in that reference fails to correct the basic deficiencies of the primary reference. Therefore, even if the combination is correct, the combination fails to suggest Applicants' invention as recited in these claims. Further, to maintain the issue, Applicants respectfully submit that the

combination is not well founded. The client ID of Reiche does not contain any personal information about the user and so Reiche provided the very feature cited as the motivation for modifying Reiche. Again, when Reiche is considered as a whole Reiche teaches that the motivation for the combination of references is not well founded. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 5.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 2, 4, and 6. With respect to Claims 2, 4, and 6, the above comments are applicable and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 2, 4, and 6.

With respect to Claims 7 to 10, these claims distinguish over the combination of references for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 7 to 10.

Claims 1 to 10 remain in the application. Claims 1 to 6 have been amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 11, 2007.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

December 11, 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899